

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/532,395	03/22/2000	Gregory F. Ward	8053	
7	590 12/26/2002			
Gregory F Ward 11115 Rotherick Drive			EXAMINER	
Alpharetta, GA			PRATT, CHRISTOPHER C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1771 DATE MAILED: 12/26/2002	9
				1

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	09/532,395	GREGORY F. WARD			
·	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Christopher C Pratt	1771			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	s		
THE REPLY FILED 04 December 2002 FAILS TO PLAC Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to av final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	old abandonment of this applica	tion. A proper reply to	a		
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]				
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The office have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the content of the cont	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth a later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH date on which the petition under 37 CFF f extension and the corresponding amount he shortened statutory period for reply of the later than three months after the mail	date of the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. See R 1.136(a) and the appropria ant of the fee. The appropria	MPEP te extension ate extension		
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR	Brief must be filed within the per	riod set forth in the appeal.			
$2. \boxtimes$ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because		11 200			
(a) $oxed{oxed}$ they raise new issues that would require further	r consideration and/or search (s	ee NOTF helow)			
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note be	elow);	- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or		ially reducing or simplif	ying the		
(d)  they present additional claims without canceling	g a corresponding number of fin	ally rejected claims			
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.					
Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejectio					
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would b canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>					
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reapplication in condition for allowance because: Appl.	econsideration has been consid licant's arguments rely on a nonente	ered but does NOT pla ered amendment.	ce the		
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becauraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	use it is not directed SOLELY to	issues which were nev	vly		
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s explanation of how the new or amended claims wou	s) a)⊠ will not be entered or b)[ ild be rejected is provided below	will be entered and a or appended.	ın		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:					
Claim(s) allowed:  Claim(s) objected to:  Claim(s) rejected: <u>10-18</u> .  Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.					
D. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(					
0. ☐ Other:		·•			
			j		
Patent and Trademark Office					



Continuation of 2. NOTE: Applicant's proposed amendment attempts to cancel all the previous claims and add new claims. These claims have not been examined and would have to be compared to the previous claims and examined for possible new 112 problems. Al new claims will also have to be examined in comparison to the previous prior art rejections to determine to what extent their scope has been modified. Applicant's declarations have not been considered because they were not timely filed. Applicant argues that the final rejection was premature because the prior amendments were valid. The amendment was valid in the sense that it could be, and was in fact, entered; however, said amendment added new limitations concerning pore size and distribution. Said limitations were never previously of record and were therefore never examined. As such, finality was appropriate.

TERREL MORRIS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700